

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/681,585	10/07/2003	Jarmo Lehtonen	944-003.192	6853	
	7590 06/08/2007 OLA VAN DER SLUYS &	EXAM	EXAMINER		
ADOLPHSON, LLP			SHIH, HAOSHIAN		
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5 755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MONROE, CT	06468		2173		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
·			06/08/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/681,585	LEHTONEN, JARMO	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Haoshian Shih	2173	

	Haoshian Shih	2173 ·	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 29 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ring replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in one with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth		
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	•	
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount thortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) a
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beta appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) They present additional claims without canceling a contraction.</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); ter form for appeal by materially re	TE below); ducing or simplifying	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-20. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  Claim(s)		ll be entered and an e	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ils to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	•	·	
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>		n condition for allowa	nce because:
<ol> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (</li> <li>13. ☐ Other:</li> </ol>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		

PRIMARY EXAMINER

**Art Unit: 2173** 

Continuation of 11. NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As set forth in the previous office action, the claims are not patentable in view of the prior art of record.

## **RESPOND TO ARGUMENT**

1. Applicant argues "independent claims 1, 11 and 19... It is not possible to replace the stick member 22 of Inukai with the integrated joypad 125 of Oueslati, as the Office proposes, because there is not enough space between the keys of a keyboard for the integrated joypad. But even if the joypad/ button of Oueslati could somehow be placed in between keys of a keyboard in replacement of the stick member of Inukai as proposed by the Office, it would not be possible to use it as required by the invention, i.e. the button could not receive an end portion of an indicator instrument and move or deform in response to a force exerted on the button via the indicator instrument, because again, there is not enough space between the keys of the keyboard."

In response to the applicant's arguments, Inukai discloses at par. [0048] "The stick hole 19a is designed to have a predetermined opening diameter capable of preventing the stick member 22 from making contact with the keyboard substrate 19 even if the stick member 22 is tilted in any directions".

In other words, the stick hole is designed in such a way that the movement of the stick member is free to tilt in any direction without obstructing the surrounding. Further more, the combination of Inukai and Oueslati is not based on the ground of their structure, a person of ordinary skill in art can easily make the stick member detectable on a keyboard or a PDA for the benefit of an increased portability.

Application/Control Number: 10/681,585 Page 3

Art Unit: 2173

2. Applicant argues "dependent <u>claims 8 and 14</u>, both require that the input button move or deform so as to communicate a force directed <u>orthogonally</u> to the surface of the communication or computing device. The Office asserts that Inukai discloses this at par. [0050] in connection with the stick member 22

of Inukai being used to indicate a ~clicking input." Applicant respectfully points out that at the cited

location all that is disclosed in this respect is that:

... if the detection signals from the transducers 9a and 9b represent more than a predetermined

amount, the above program processes to establish a state where an operation signal

representing a click has been input.

In other words, if the stick member is pushed horizontally (the only possible motion disclosed by Inukai)

by more than a certain amount, that excessive push in the horizontal direction is interpreted as a clicking

input, without there having been a force directed orthogonally to the surface of the communication or

computing device. Thus, the stick member 22 of Inukai cannot be said to communicate such a force as

required by the invention, since it cannot sense such a force. In fact, if an orthogonal force is applied,

the stick member will not move at all, and so an orthogonal force cannot be used to indicate a

clicking input (or any other input). "

In response to the applicant's argument, Inukai discloses at par. [0050] "When the cross

area 7 is deformed in operation amount and direction of the stick member 22 the

transducers 9a and 9b detect the deformation amount of the cross area 7... if the

detection signals from the transducers 9a and 9b represent more than a predetermined

Application/Control Number: 10/681,585

Art Unit: 2173

amount, the above program processes to establish a state where an operation signal representing a click has been input."

In other words, if the stick member is pushed orthogonally (fig.1; the stick member 22 is orthogonally positioned to the surface area 7) transducers 9a and 9b detects the deformation amount of the cross area 7 and communicate the deformation force as a clicking input.

3. Applicant argues, "in addition in respect to dependent <u>claims 9 and 17</u>, Oueslati does not teach or suggest an input button moving or deforming <u>so as to communicate a force couple</u> (as in claim 9), or sensing means for providing a signal <u>indicative of a force couple</u> (as in claim 17)"

In response to the applicant's argument, Inukai discloses at par. [0058] "stick member 22 to tilt toward the plus sides in the X-axis and the Y-axis directions", par. [0059] "the deformation of the cross area 7 induced as above causes a tensile strain in the strain sensor 8a...In regard to the strain sensor 8b placed on the plus side of the Y-axis the resistant value of a portion positioned on the right of the Y-axis increases due to the tensile strain..." and par. [0060], "the signal outputs are amplified to be used as the strain amount detection signal...which executes the pointing control program."

The applicant discloses force couple at par. [0033] "... one or another force or combination of forces (couples)"

In other words, the motion of tilting the stick member 22 towards both X and Y axis directions results in tensile strain to strain sensor 8a and 8b at the same time, indicating

Art Unit: 2173

a combination of forces (force couples) applied to multiple strain sensors on the cross area 7, the strain signals are then captured and used in a pointing control program.

Page 5

4. Applicant argues, "dependent claim 10, applicant respectfully submits that the Inukai and Oueslati cannot be said to teach or suggest the recited box-in-box construction...for the reasons given in respect to claim 1, though, there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification."

In response to the applicant's argument, please refer back to the Examiner's response to independent claims 1, 11 and 19.

## Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teaches content previewing and content selection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haoshian Shih whose telephone number is (571) 270-1257. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 0730-1700.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (571)272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/681,585

Art Unit: 2173

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**HSS** 

PRIMARY EXAMINER